

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Action mailed January 26, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not described in the specification. Support for the language of Claims 1-29 can be found at page 9, lines 19-29; page 11, lines 9-18; and page 34, lines 1-7. As disclosed in the passages above, a render job is represented by a render file storing one or more render frames. A schedule server may distribute frames to be rendered to several render hosts. The schedule server can track the progress of the render frames and communicate with the client. A sample of a render job may be provided prior to completion of the render job to the client. Since a frame is part of a render job, a sample of a rendered frame may be provided to the client. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-29 are in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cajolet in view of Hancock, et al. Independent Claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 recite in general an ability to provide one or more samples of the rendered first or second frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of rendering the first or second frame by the first and second servers and receive an input from the client in response to the one or more samples. By contrast, as shown in col. 10, lines 34-37, of the Cajolet patent, the assisting computer completes its portion of the task and then returns its results to the problem dispatcher. There is no disclosure in the Cajolet patent that its assisting computer provides samples of rendered frames prior to completing its portion of

the render job as required by the claimed invention. Thus, the Cajolet patent has no capability to provide one or more samples of the rendered first or second frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of rendering the first or second frames by the first and second servers as required by the claimed invention. In addition, the Cajolet patent is not capable of receiving an input from the client in response to the one or more samples as the Cajolet patent has no capability to provide samples of rendered frames. The portion of the Cajolet patent cited by the Examiner relating to receipt of client input merely discusses assigning uncompleted portions of a task to an available assisting computer when an originally assigned assisting computer has been interrupted. Thus, the portion of the Cajolet patent cited by the Examiner is not related at all to receipt of client input let alone in response to the one or more samples as required in the claimed invention. Moreover, the Hancock, et al. paper merely discloses providing a progressive view of the rendered image. The Hancock, et al. patent does not disclose any capability to receive an input from the client in response to the one or more samples as provided by the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-29 are patentably distinct from the proposed Cajolet - Hancock, et al. combination.

This Response to Examiner's Final Action is necessary to address assertions made by the Examiner in characterizing the cited art. This Response to Examiner's Final Action could not have been presented earlier as the Examiner has only now provided the current assertions in the Final Action.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments associated with this Application to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Charles S. Fish', is written over the printed name.

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

April 26, 2007

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 32764